



Zion's Trumpet

RR 3 Box 985 Mifflintown, Pa. 17059

Phone ~ (717) 436-8773

e-mail ~ dan_o_mace@hotmail.com

April 29th 2008

Dear Mr. Brogden,

I recently read a response you gave to another brother in a discussion forum, regarding the question of whether or not you are teaching "Ultimate Reconciliation" in your latest book: "*The Irresistible Kingdom*". Your answer to his question, which also involved some comments about me and what I said regarding your book, were disingenuous. I will include the letter you sent this brother, so you will know that I have not misunderstood or misinterpreted anything you said, or quoted your words out of context.

One of the statements you made about me was: "...by his own admission he doesn't know me, hasn't met me, and hasn't even spoken with me." Since when does a reader have to "know" the author of a book personally, before he can make a proper judgment regarding what is being taught in that book? Do you require the same thing of those who agree with you? When they tell you how wonderful you are and how great your writings are, do you call *their* ability to judge into question, just because they don't know you? I think not! You only use this argument on those who *disagree* with you. God's people don't have to know *you* before they can properly discern the truth or the error of what you write. The only person they need to know in order to judge what you (or any other teacher writes) is the Lord Jesus Christ.

Moreover, I did try to speak with you. After reading your book, I emailed you with a question. I'm sure you were too busy to reply to that email—and maybe you didn't even read it—but it's not my fault if you don't read or respond to your emails. Below is a copy of that email:

From: Dan Mace
Date: 2/23/2008 12:16:06 PM
To: info@theschoolofchrist.org
Subject: The Heavenly Order

Dear Mr. Brogden,

After reading your most recent book, "The Irresistible Kingdom", I have a question. Do you believe Satan will also (eventually) be restored and brought back into the "Heavenly Order"?

Best Regards.
Dan Mace
dan_o_mace@hotmail.com

I do not engage in gossip and slander. I am not one of those who, as you say, "...gather together a group of people, make false accusations, and then post these accusations to their websites and blogs without even communicating with me or asking me to clarify anything". I have enough of the fear of God not to falsely accuse a brother in the Lord of something.

I read your book thoroughly, several times, to make sure I was *not* misunderstanding or misinterpreting what you were saying. You ARE teaching the ultimate reconciliation (or restoration) of all men in that book—and I think you know this very well. If you don't realize this is what you are teaching, you should by now because you have been approached by more than one person regarding the matter.

In your response to this brother's question about whether or not you are teaching Ultimate Reconciliation in that book, one of the things you said was that whenever someone challenges a doctrine that people hold dear, those people can do either one of two things. Either they can: "...respond Scripturally or they can demonize the person who challenges their mindset...". Well, perhaps you should look in the mirror brother, for that is exactly what you did to me.

In my audio critique, I gave a dozen direct quotes from the book itself, which were supportive of the Ultimate Reconciliation view. You have not responded to, or made any attempt to clarify any of those statements. Instead you have chosen to do the very thing you complain that people do to you. You demonize me by saying: "*Anyone who holds a different view from his own is apparently under the influence of a demon.*"

Since you don't know me, you can't possibly know just how wrong that statement is. No, I do not believe any one who holds a different view than me is demon possessed or under the influence of demons. However, I do believe there are a *few doctrines* that are so unscriptural and so spiritually dangerous, there is no doubt they came straight from the mouth of Satan—and the error of Ultimate Reconciliation is one of them. Ultimate Reconciliation is a "doctrine of devils" (*I. Tim. 4:1*), and those who embrace it are indeed opening themselves up to the influence of religious, seducing spirits. So if the shoe fits.....

It's interesting to note that while you stand outside the Church System and speak against the corruptness of it's leaders, you do precisely the same thing they do when they are faced with the fact that they are preaching error. They use the very same scriptures you did—Gal. 6:1 (they also use Matt. 18:15-17)—to delegitimize all opposition on the grounds that those who oppose them did not go to them privately and discuss the issue first, before going public. This puts a stigma on the character of the one who is making the challenge, as if they are afraid to confront the one who is in error, or have something to hide, or are guilty of engaging in slander and gossip.

The truth is, those scriptures are talking about *private* faults and sins. They are talking about an individual sinning against God or another brother. It is in *that context* that we are commanded to go directly to the brother and confront him, and try to restore him in meekness. These verses have nothing to do with *public ministry*. They do not apply to those who have become teachers to the body of Christ. God's people are not duty-bound to come to you first, before they discern the truth or error of what you say. Nor are we required to come to you first, before we speak out publicly against an error you (or anyone else) is teaching. What you teach publicly may be *challenged* publicly—with or without your consultation.

However, in the interest of being up front and honest, and in the interest of ascertaining just what you are teaching, I'm going to do what you (not the Scriptures) are requiring. I am going to ask you some point blank questions and give you a few of the quotes I used from your book, in order to give you a chance to respond and show the body of Christ you are not teaching *any form* of Ultimate Reconciliation. If you choose not to answer this letter, that's your privilege. You don't owe me anything. But I will be free

of your accusation that I have not taken the “Biblical” approach to challenging what you teach—and it will be *you* who bears the reproach concerning the issue.

So my first question is: *Can you unequivocally say you believe many, many people will spend Eternity in the place the Scripture calls the “Lake of Fire”?*

My second question is like the first one: *Can you unequivocally say you believe those who end up in the “Lake of Fire” will never be released from that place?*

My third question is: *Can you unequivocally say, as does the Scripture, that the purpose of the “Lake of Fire” is not to cleanse or purify those who are there, but to punish them and torment them because they have rejected the salvation they were offered?*

Frankly, I don’t believe you can answer a simple “Yes” to any of these questions.

In fact, I believe the *whole purpose* of your book was to make the reader question the truth of God’s Word on this particular matter. I believe the *whole purpose* of your book was to put a doubt in the readers mind regarding the reliability of (what you call) the traditional Church view, that multitudes of people will *spend Eternity* in the Lake of Fire, and that the purpose of the Lake of Fire is to impose divine, eternal, vengeance and punishment on those who have rejected the salvation Jesus provided on the Cross.

The simple fact is, you no longer believe God is *that kind* of a God. You no longer believe He would send people into *eternal* torment as an act of divine vengeance and retribution. You no longer believe this view of God is Scriptural. Rather, you now believe it came from a corrupted Church. So why don’t you just come clean and admit the truth?

Next, I will provide just a few of the many statements from your book which I discussed in my chat room—statements you say I just “*don’t understand*”. Well, if I am not understanding them correctly, here’s your chance to correct my understanding. Here’s your chance to “clarify” your position. Here’s your chance to explain (if you can) why these statements should *not* be understood as an endorsement of the ultimate reconciliation of all men. On page 144 of your book you say:

We have seen that God’s ultimate intention and purpose is to have the preeminence in all things. How is this accomplished? From the point of view of the Cross, it is already an accomplished fact. He has already made peace with all things through the blood of His Cross. **This is a universal work, and so it most certainly includes “all men”, not just some men...**

...This peace, having already been made, is referred to in the past tense. This peace having been made by Christ on the Cross shows that what was done has completely satisfied the heart of God. When Jesus prayed ‘Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do,’ does anyone doubt that this prayer of the Son of God was somehow dismissed or overlooked by His Father? And since everything Jesus does is full of spiritual significance and meaning, are we content to believe that He was merely asking the Father to forgive the people in front of Him who were in the process of crucifying Him? Or can we discern a deeper meaning: that His prayer for forgiveness **extends to the entire fallen race of Adam, that whole flock of**

sheep that had ‘turned every man to his own way’, for which he now intends to gather together again—as a shepherd gathers his scattered, lost sheep together into the fold?...

...If so, then Christ's prayer from the Cross would **tend to reinforce the idea** that He really did make peace with **all men** in order to reconcile **them all**. ‘If I be lifted up from the earth [on the Cross] I will draw all men unto me’. Could the Fisher of Men **let even one of them get away**? Could the Good Shepherd **fail** to locate and bring home **even one** lost sheep?”

Please explain how the statement—“*This is a universal work, and so it most certainly includes ‘all men’, not just some men*”—is not an endorsement of the ultimate reconciliation of all men.

Please explain how the statement that we should view Jesus’ prayer from the Cross as extending to: “*...the entire fallen race of Adam, that whole flock of sheep that had ‘turned every man to his own way’, for which he now intends to gather together again—as a shepherd gathers his scattered, lost sheep together into the fold?*”—is not an endorsement of the ultimate reconciliation of all men.

Please clarify how the statement— “*...then Christ’s prayer from the Cross would tend to reinforce the idea that He really did make peace with all men in order to reconcile them all*”—is not an endorsement of the ultimate reconciliation of all men.

Tell me why the questions: “*Could the Fisher of Men let even one of them get away? Could the Good Shepherd fail to locate and bring home even one lost sheep?*”—should not be seen as an endorsement of the ultimate reconciliation of all men.

Everyone who reads your book knows what the *implied* answer to these questions are! The implied answer is; No—the Fisher of Men *will not* let even one of them get away. No—the Good Shepherd *will not fail* to locate and bring home every last one of the lost sheep (ie: the entire fallen race of Adam).

You may think that teaching doctrine *implicitly* by asking questions, or by *insinuation* through phrases like: “maybe”, “perhaps”, “could it be that”, etc., is a slick way to approach the subject, but I can assure you God doesn’t view it that way. God’s way is just the opposite. His way is to: “*...write the vision and make it plain*” (*Hab. 2:2*). Just because you couch what you are teaching within the framework of questions and vague “what ifs”, that does not mean you are not really teaching the point you are trying to make. A doctrine that comes from *implied answers* to questions, or from *subtle insinuations*, is no different than a doctrine that comes from matter-of-fact statements.

What you really believe comes through again and again in that book. As a matter of fact, the way you teach the ultimate reconciliation of all men in this book is precisely the way the Serpent works to deceive people’s minds—through questions and insinuations and what ifs. As just one of *many examples* I could provide, on pages 315-316 you make the following statements:

“Judgment is not merely to punish, but **there is a redemptive purpose in judgment**. And so the Bible says, ‘When your judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness’. History has shown that there is no

other way to really learn the wickedness of evil apart from seeing, feeling, and experiencing God's wrath upon evil. This is obviously a painful experience; the question is: **is it something God intends for people to experience endlessly?**

For the Lord will not cast off forever; but though He cause great grief, yet will He have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies. For He does not afflict willingly nor grieve the children of men.

Lamentations 3:31-33

We have no intention of entering into a theological debate on eternal punishment. Both sides of the argument make excellent points. We would simply point out that there yet remains one more chapter in the Bible beyond the establishment of New Jerusalem. God is not yet finished with mankind!"

This is a clear example of teaching doctrine through implied answers and subtle insinuation. First you say God's judgment is not simply to punish people, but that there is (the implication is *always*) a redemptive purpose in judgment. Then you say there is no other way to learn the wickedness of evil apart from experiencing the wrath of God. Then you ask if experiencing this wrath is: "...*something God intends for people to experience endlessly?*" Then you quote a passage of Scripture which answers the question for the reader, according to your liking. The passage says very clearly that God "...*will not cast off forever*" and that even though He might cause grief: "...*yet will He have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies*".

[*Of course, you conveniently neglected to tell the reader that this passage is talking about the **temporal** punishment of National Israel, not the **eternal** punishment of the unsaved. But hey, the end justifies the means, right? What's wrong with intentionally misleading the reader, as long as they end up believing what God wants them to believe?*]

By asking the question the way that you did, and then answering it with that passage, you *insinuated* the answer to the reader—and the answer is clearly: No, according to God's Word, His wrath *is not* something people will experience endlessly. Then you say you have no intention of entering into a "theological debate" about eternal punishment! That's slick brother! Very slick. But it's also very dishonest because what you are really saying is that you have no intention of *examining both sides* of the eternal punishment issue in a fair manner. What you are saying is that you intend to look at only *one* side of the issue—the side you are promoting in your book! There will be no "debate" because you are completely biased in your conclusions and you refuse to even address the other side of the issue, except when making sweeping, generalized, sardonic remarks about how wicked and stupid the Church has been for promoting such a horrible doctrine like eternal punishment.

On page 318 you make the following statement:

"Most importantly, **if the Lake of Fire forever seals the fate** of everyone who is considered lost (as the Church has always interpreted), how then do we explain the following invitation?"

Please explain why I should *not* understand this statement as an endorsement of the ultimate restoration of all men. On page 320 you say:

"If Jesus wishes to show grace **to everyone** and make **us all** 'equal' in the end, why should that bother those who have labored longer"

Please clarify what you meant by that statement. Please explain to me why, when you say "*everyone*" will be shown the grace of God, and that God will make *us all equal*, I should not understand that to be an insinuation of and/or an endorsement of the ultimate restoration of all men.

On page 321 and 322 you talk about the "Final Age" called "The Dispensation of the Fullness of the Times. This is an age after the Millennium, after the creation of the new Heaven and the new Earth. At this point, you say "all things" (and this includes ALL people) will be gathered together in one in Christ. Speaking of us being in that Final Age, you say:

"Perhaps, when we stand with Him there in the midst of His Irresistible Kingdom, we will think back to the former times, when we did not yet see all things submitted to Him; those times when the earth was still under a curse; when mankind was still dominated by Sin, Self, and Satan...

...We will certainly think back on everything God revealed to us through the ages, how He took us deeper and deeper into Christ, and how quickly we were overwhelmed by the depths of His love, His grace, His kindness, and His mercy.

At some point it will happen: **the last one will surrender their heart to Christ**, and the news will be declared across all Creation: that **all the lost sheep have been found; all the prodigal sons have come home**; all the enemies have been defeated, and **all things are submitted to Christ.**"

Tell me Mr. Brogden—go ahead and tell me that when you wrote: "*...the last one will surrender their heart to Christ*" and the news will be declared across all Creation that, "*...all the lost sheep have been found*" and "*all the prodigal sons have come home*", you are not teaching the ultimate reconciliation of all men.

Well, I could go on and on with these quotes, but I'll spare you the time. Anyone with an ounce of spiritual discernment could have figured out what you were teaching just by looking at the title: **The Irresistible Kingdom; God's Marvelous Purpose for All things And its Unavoidable Fulfillment**. Excuse me? If God's kingdom is really "irresistible", then eventually everyone will end up in it, won't they?

Again, I am enclosing a copy of the letter you wrote the brother I mentioned. Also, I am enclosing his comments about your book. It's very interesting; at first he didn't believe you were teaching this error. But after researching the matter for himself, he came to the same conclusion I did.

Sincerely,
Daniel O. Mace

Hello Bill,

I have more than one hundred articles and several dozen audio teachings on my website. These, along with my book, all say the same thing I have said for years: that God's eternal purpose is to gather together in one all things in Christ. This is not something I just invented, or something I just started teaching. This is what the Scriptures have declared for 2,000 years. Here is an article I wrote more than eight years ago that has been in full view the whole time:

<http://www.theschoolofchrist.org/articles/allthings.html>

My emphasis in this article (and in all my teachings) is how GREAT Christ is. My insight into the greatness of Christ, the sufficiency of the Cross, and the fullness of God's eternal purpose did not come from reading or listening to other people. It came from prayer and study of the Scriptures.

Not long after the article above was published someone wrote in and said, "You're teaching Universalism." I thought, really? I don't even know what Universalism is. So I spent two years studying Universalism. I found Universalism to be unscriptural. Some Universalists do not believe in hell. Some do not believe in sin. Some do not believe in the devil. Some give you the impression that everyone will be saved eventually, so evangelism is a waste of time and it doesn't matter what you do or what you believe.

All of this of course I rejected, and do reject. So when you say someone is a Universalist that is a pretty broad label that can mean a lot of things. I cannot deny the many Scriptures which indicate that God intends for Christ to have the preeminence in all things, that every knee will bow and every tongue will confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, that if He is lifted up then He will draw all men to Himself, that He has taken away the sin of the whole world, etc. etc. Although these Scriptures appear to contradict other Scriptures which speak of eternal punishment, I do not believe the Scriptures can contradict themselves. There are many seeming contradictions in the Word of God that are resolved through prayerful study and Spirit-and-Truth revelation. For example, the Suffering Messiah versus the Victorious Messiah. Since the Jews focused on the Victorious Messiah they completely overlooked all the "contradictory" Scriptures of a Suffering Messiah, and so they failed to recognize Jesus when He appeared. How many similar examples could we find from Church history? I believe the contradiction is in our traditional interpretation of what these Scriptures mean. In my research I have found that Organized Religion lays too much emphasis on the parts it agrees with and not enough emphasis on the parts it doesn't understand - just like the Jews. I don't question the Scriptures, but I do question what religious tradition teaches us the Scriptures mean. That makes me a good Berean. It does not make me a Universalist.

Most of our ideas about the Bible did not come to us as a result of prayer and asking for the Holy Spirit to lead us into truth. Instead, we simply accepted what we were told and now we believe it without question. Whenever someone challenges that belief those who hold it can either respond Scripturally or they can demonize the person who challenges their mindset as a heretic. Sadly, history shows that most people choose the latter, and rather than exercise their own spiritual discernment, they rely upon the thoughts and opinions of others to tell them what to believe. If they cannot physically kill those who disagree with them they simply attack their credibility and try to destroy their ministry.

As to this individual quoting my book, by his own admission he doesn't know me, hasn't met me, and hasn't even spoken with me. He is entitled to his opinion but I understand he thinks I'm demon possessed, or have opened up my mind to a seducing spirit. Anyone who holds a different view from his own is apparently under the influence of a demon. At the same time he says there are a lot of good things in my book, but he never mentions any of them. He focuses his remarks on the parts he doesn't understand and disagrees with. Why? Because he wants to magnify the devil and exaggerate the devil's power while minimizing and limiting the Cross of Christ. He has more belief in the devil's power to deceive than in the Holy Spirit's power to reveal the truth. The religious actually accused Jesus of being demon-possessed, so I do not expect to be treated any better than my Lord. I have no intention of defending myself against people like that. The fruit of the life of Christ and His work in me and through me is defense enough.

If someone believes I am wrong about something then the Scripture provides a clear path for them to follow: "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness;

considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted" (Gal. 6:1). No one has taken this approach with me. Instead, they gather together a group of people, make false accusations, and then post these accusations to their websites and blogs without even communicating with me or asking me to clarify anything. The resulting discord and confusion is certainly not the work of the Holy Spirit. All of this hinders the Testimony of Jesus, distracts us from Christ, and makes us a laughing stock to the world.

Jesus asked, "Why do you make the Word of God of no effect because of your tradition?" I believe it is incredibly small-minded to place limits on what God will or will not do, or minimize the work of the Cross by our own inability to grasp its fullness. I am on solid Scriptural ground to continually assert the greatness of our Lord Jesus Christ and His irresistible Kingdom.

Chip Brogden

Bill's assessment of The Irresistible Kingdom:

Brothers and sisters. I have all the evidence required to make a informed assessment of Chip Brogden's book. The evidence has come from Chips book itself. He is teaching a UR doctrine and no matter what he says he is, he qualifies as a believer in Ultimate Reconciliation. If anyone requires this evidence I suggest you buy the book. I will no longer be posting anything from Chip Brogden on this forum, and if I can edit out any of his material without causing too much difficulty I will be doing so.

Can I say this has not been an exercise of digging up dirt on anyone but purely a testing and discerning of a individuals teaching to see if it has any credibility of Truth according to the Scriptures.

Chips book does NOT. It is a doctrine of demons and as such we should not give heed to it. I will be posting to Chip asking him if he will recant of these beliefs and stop promoting them among the body of Christ. Apart from this I will pray the Holy Ghost convict him and show him the error of his way, and I will pray that his influence and his teaching on this particular subject will fall on deaf ears.

The matter is ended for me.